UNITED NATIONS

General Assembly

FORTY-SEVENTH SESSION

Official Records

FIRST COMMITTEE
23rd meeting
held on
Monday, 2 November 1992
at 10 a.m.
New York

VERBATIM RECORD OF THE 23rd MEETING

Chairman: Mr. ELARABY (Egypt)

later: Mr. PATOKALLIO (Finland)
(Chairman)

CONTENTS

- Consideration of draft resolutions under all disarmament and international security items (continued)

This record is subject to correction.
Corrections should be sent under the signature of a member of the delegation concerned *within one week of the date of publication* to the Chief of the Official Records Editing Section, Room DC2-750, 2 United Nations Plaza, and incorporated in a copy of the record.

Corrections will be issued after the end of the session, in a separate corrigendum for each Committee.

92-61700 2508V (E)

Distr. GENERAL
A/C.1/47/PV.23
27 November 1992

ENGLISH

The meeting was called to order at 10.30 a.m.

AGENDA ITEMS 49 to 65, 68 and 142; 67 and 69 (continued)

CONSIDERATION OF DRAFT RESOLUTIONS UNDER ALL DISARMAMENT AND INTERNATIONAL SECURITY ITEMS

Mr. ARRIA (Venezuela)(interpretation from Spanish): As this is the first time that our delegation has spoken, I should like to congratulate you, Mr. Chairman, and the other officers of the Committee on your election and to express to you, Sir, our special feeling of solidarity on the occasion of the tragedy that recently afflicted your country.

I should like to divide my statement into two parts. In the first part, which I shall give now, I shall offer some thoughts and ideas concerning some of the draft resolutions that have been submitted. The second part, which I shall not read but which will be distributed to delegations, is just an expression of my country's position on the agenda items.

The end of the ideological confrontation, socio-economic systems, and military and strategic interests which dominated international relations until quite recently has made it possible as never before for us to avail ourselves of extraordinary opportunities for peace and understanding among nations but at the same time, more than ever before, it has brought with it a certain level of instability. Furthermore, the transition towards new national defence policies and new regional security structures keeps the international community in a state of uncertainty with regard to collective security in the future.

In spite of the greater degree of security which is beginning to emerge thanks to this new climate of cooperation, there persist, as we all know, many risks to international peace and security such as the consequences of the arms

(Mr. Arria, Venezuela)

race, the human and material costs of disputes arising from economic and social imbalances and the resurgence and fanaticism of national and ethnic movements. The attainment for peace is not yet by any means free from difficulties, and threats persist which, because of their global implications, require shared approaches and solutions.

The nature of these threats also demonstrates that if we are to overcome them, the interests and particular views of a small number of countries are not in themselves enough if they do not incorporate the values and principles embodied in the United Nations Charter, which are shared by all nations and which today there is a historic opportunity to put into effect.

There is no doubt that the international security system should, in the future, change from the exclusively military approach, which so affected the world for almost half a century, to other approaches in which the sources of instability and threats to international peace and security are seen to derive from social, economic, humanitarian and ecological causes.

A small country such as our own, without a nuclear capacity and without any wish to acquire one, a country without a secret agenda, a country which does not export arms and whose principal objective is to consolidate the security and well-being of its people, a country which has has prompted our country to support all international disarmament efforts can, we believe, make an objective contribution to this debate.

We therefore continue to be dismayed when we see a world in which our capacity for action is restricted to efforts within the walls of this Organization and to its principles - by no means a comforting feeling. We still feel vulnerable and defenceless.

Military secrecy, something quite distinct from the strategic concept of confidentiality which is necessary for the security of a nation, continues to

(Mr. Arria, Venezuela)

stimulate over-armament. The purveyors of arms do their best to exaggerate the real offensive capacity of supposed adversaries, thus generating their own demand. Regional conflicts only benefit arms merchants, who are not under anyone's supervision, not even under the supervision of Governments in spite of the real responsibilities which they have for world instability. These Governments must shoulder their responsibilities. World public opinion is still too indulgent to these merchants and these Governments.

Now, at the end of 1992, disproportionate military expenditures continue to pose a threat to the economic security of most countries, particularly developing countries. In a world where increasing poverty constitutes a major factor for instability there would not be sufficient armaments to control the poor people of the world and forced migrations. A nation which is not developing is in no way secure. Now we know that real security can in no way be based on military force. Japan and Germany are particularly telling examples of this.

Throughout the so-called cold war the major Powers were particularly assiduous and meticulous in maintaining a kind of international accounting of nuclear weapons. It was a way of preserving the balance of terror to which the whole of humanity was subject for so many years.

(Mr. Arria, Venezuela)

Regrettably, for the developing countries such concern was lacking when it came to selling conventional arms to poor countries, with the results we are suffering from today. Undoubtedly, Somalia is the most striking example of this - a country upon which military assistance was lavished with particular generosity. Today, it is a victim of the end of the cold war, armed to the teeth and possessing more arms than food. Nobody was thinking there of balance. After all, conventional weapons could not wreak damage much beyond the frontiers of the country. Undoubtedly, this is a dangerous and irresponsible policy. Today the United Nations is attempting a programme of exchanging food for arms, because weapons have become the country's best method of payment. Comments are unnecessary.

Many of our countries must modernize their laws, which conceal the expenditure of enormous and disproportionate financial resources. If these expenditures were transparent, they would be considerably reduced, and so would the room for corruption.

National legislation which prevents States from providing information to the Register of Conventional Arms voluntarily, as was agreed at the last session of the General Assembly, should be adapted to fit this new arrangement in the international community. There is no doubt that the Register is a basic step forward in achieving more transparent accountability in the inventory of international military hardware. Our own country encounters legal limitations inherited from other times, and we are doing what we can to modify them in the light of new international circumstances. We should take advantage of this international consensus to introduce the necessary legal

(Mr. Arria, Venezuela)

reforms. Aware of this fact, Venezuela sponsored the draft resolution on the subject at the last session of the General Assembly. We are confident that the Register of conventional arms should move forward until it becomes obligatory and that it should be expanded to include inventories and production levels in all States that produce arms. It is only in this way that we can try to find out what transfers are taking place and come to know the world arms inventory. But this is precisely what we do not know today because of the lack of transparency in the area.

A world which still spends about $1,000 billion a year on armaments cannot be a safe place for anyone. The poorest part of this world still devotes $150 billion dollars a year to military expenditures. Some $40 billion is spent on the importation of arms from the industrialized world.

What is known as the "peace dividend" has generated an appreciable amount of resources which could undoubtedly be used for cooperation in international development, but everything seems to show that this will not be the case. It would seem unrealistic for developing countries like ours to expect that this saving in military expenditure on the part of major countries would be transferred and used for dealing with our enormous and overwhelming agenda of development needs.

Excessive expectations from the "peace dividend" on the part of developed countries have turned our attention - voluntarily in some cases, in others unwillingly - to the real opportunity, which is actually within our reach, of creating our own peace dividend. It is estimated we could devote some $40 billion to funding our own development, to arm ourselves with health, education and dignity - in a word, to shield ourselves and make ourselves

(Mr. Arria, Venezuela)

really safe and not to go on impoverishing ourselves with what is so rightly called excessive military hardware.

We have seen, with stupefaction, surprise and alarm, the way that the continuation of arms sales has succeeded in being justified, even the sales of material and equipment associated with nuclear activities, by using arguments based on economic considerations. According to such arguments, conversion of the military and nuclear industry is a difficult process, and for economic reasons it is necessary to continue producing and selling armaments.

I wonder what the reaction of world public opinion would be if countries sowing and producing coca, opium and marijuana were to argue that they could not replace these crops by others because they are so profitable. I am convinced that the world would not go along passively with such an argument, and rightly so. However, we have been shocked to see how the trade in arms and the tools of devastation continues to be carried on both by major and medium-sized countries. This unacceptable double standard is unquestionably immoral and hypocritical, and actively militates against world security.

Our Organization was established to promote world peace. Conventional wisdom maintains that arms are acquired to ensure peace, but we all know that the arms race which it generated unleashes a dynamic of insecurity, whence the fact that all the world buys arms. We are now emerging from this nightmare, particularly the nuclear nightmare, but we must stop the conventional arms race, which is the great nightmare, in particular of poor countries.

Peace is facilitated and secured by fewer arms. It was for this that the United Nations were established, for peacemaking and peace-keeping, and it is for this reason that we believe our Organization can do no less than invest all its commitment, energy, will and undeniable authority and prestige in halting this race against humanity. Pressure by the international community

(Mr. Arria, Venezuela)

has undoubtedly laid the groundwork for countries with a nuclear capacity to reach many important agreements shown on our disarmament agenda, but undoubtedly it has been the change in the world situation and self-interest itself and the economic limitations of these countries that have determined the depth and pace of these agreements.

We are on the right path so far as the so-called weapons of mass destruction are concerned. But where are we on this path as regards conventional weapons, arms smuggling, the black market in arms, which is the real problem of the developing countries? Nobody knows and there has never been any accounting?

My delegation believes that there is more than a window of opportunity opening up for the world, in fact a true moral and ethical opportunity to deal with the situation in a more imaginative fashion. For example, the General Assembly could elect an ombudsman who would have responsibility for investigating and denouncing all activities relating to the illegal trade in weapons. He would be a person with sufficient prestige to receive complaints and make recommendations that would have sufficient worldwide response.

The international private sector, engaged as it is in protecting its intellectual property patents, has effectively its own ombudsmen, who carry out their tasks with zeal and efficiency. Why not therefore create for ourselves a super-auditor or super-inspector in the area of the so-called "market of death", which each day costs us so much misfortune?

(Mr. Arria, Venezuela)

My delegation proposes that this suggestion be pursued further inasmuch as it is being well received. We should therefore like to draw attention to the fact that article 138 (e) of the Treaty of European Union - the Maastricht Treaty - provides for the appointment, by the European Parliament, of a fully independent ombudsman empowered to receive from any citizen or body of the European Communities complaints about maladministration or malfunctioning of organs of the Communities.

There can be no doubt that the collapse and consequent fragmentation of the Soviet Union have increased the risk of the loss of central control of equipment, experts and nuclear technology and that this situation must be treated with particular and urgent care. Nor should we forget that even those countries that are still developing nuclear programmes for civilian purposes could end up possessing the elements and the necessary technology for the production of nuclear weapons.*

The case of Iraq is perhaps the most eloquent example. Iraq, having received the broadest and most generous and diverse assistance, was able to acquire everything that it needed to become a producer of nuclear weapons. Nevertheless, many countries that sell this equipment and technology have still failed, as has the Government of Iraq, to provide the Ekeus Commission with all the necessary information. The real extent of Iraq's nuclear potential and its consequences has still to be made clear.

Furthermore, there is no doubt that the economic difficulties of new countries that possess nuclear material and equipment present the additional risk that the sale of such resources and of nuclear know-how will become

---

* Mr. Patokallio (Finland), Vice-Chairman, took the Chair.

Mr. Arria, Venezuela)

especially attractive. The recent capture, in Berlin, of persons who were trying to sell 5 kilograms of enriched uranium is a sufficiently serious warning to us all. Nor should we forget that Iraq signed the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons - but this did not in any way prevent it from developing its own nuclear programme: on the contrary it facilitated it.

It is neither possible nor feasible to have a nuclear balance that guarantees international peace and security in a world where, at any moment and anywhere, a new "proliferator" may appear. Only the total elimination of nuclear weapons can bring about such equilibrium. This should be the objective of the First Committee and the first task of the General Assembly.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Cameroon to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.2.

Mr. BILOA TANG (Cameroon) (interpretation from French): I have the honour and pleasure, on behalf of Angola, Burundi, Cameroon, the Central African Republic, Chad, Congo, Equatorial Guinea, Gabon, Rwanda, Sao Tome and Principe and Zaire, of introducing draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.2, entitled "Regional confidence-building measures" under agenda item 62, "Review and implemention of the Concluding Document of the Twelfth Special Session of the General Assembly".

These 11 States of the Economic Community of Central Africa are firmly convinced that the adoption of this draft resolution by the Committee would serve to promote and strengthen the impetus necessary for the implementation of confidence-building measures in Central Africa. Indeed, this subregion has more than 80 million inhabitants grouped in States, some of which are experiencing conditions that threaten conflict in the entire region and are likely to become a serious threat to international peace and security.

(Mr. Biloa Tang, Cameroon)

Thus, it is to preserve and strengthen the harmonious relations between the peoples of these States and to remove the risk of conflicts likely to harm this positive and constructive climate that our countries have given deep thought to this matter in the context of the United Nations.

This approach, which made it possible to identify a number of confidence-building measures conducive to the realization of this objective led to the adoption by consensus - and I emphasize that it was by consensus - at the forty-sixth session of the General Assembly, of resolution 46/37 B of 6 December 1991, by which the General Assembly:

"Supports and encourages efforts aimed at promoting confidence-building measures at regional and subregional levels ...;

"Welcomes the initiative taken by the States members of the Economic Community of Central African States ..."

and requests the Secretary-General of the United Nations to continue to provide assistance by, among other actions, establishing a standing advisory commmittee to deal with security questions in Central Africa.

Here I should like to express again our gratitude to the Secretary-General, who discharged his mandate by announcing on 28 May 1992 the establishment of the Standing Advisory Committee on Security Questions in Central Africa and the appointment of a Permanent Secretary of that Committee. Thus the meeting, at the ministerial level, of the Advisory Committee that was held in Yaounda from 27 to 31 July 1992 under the auspices of the United Nations, led to the adoption of a series of confidence-building measures in the form of a programme of work for a period.

(Mr. Biloa Tang, Cameroon)

As I said in my statement to the First Committee on 27 October, these confidence-building measures meet the concerns expressed by the Secretary-General in his report "An Agenda for Peace". They call for preventive diplomacy and the building and maintenance of peace - all of which depend upon the existence of appropriate verification measures.

The 11 States that are sponsoring draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.2 are convinced that the implementation of this programme of confidence-building measures is conducive to the climate of peace that is necessary to economic development, the first objective of which continues to be improvement of the well-being of peoples. This is why, as in the past, we ask for the support of the United Nations in the implementation of what is, for the whole of Africa, a pioneering initiative. We ardently hope that this draft resolution, like resolution 46/37 B of 6 December 1991, will be adopted by consensus.

Before concluding, I should like to mention a slight amendment to the draft resolution that I have just introduced: the reference, in the third preambular paragraph, to resolution 45/58 P of 4 December 1990 should be deleted.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Australia to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.20.

Ms. MOULES (Australia): I have the privilege to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.20, entitled "Second Review Conference of the Parties to the Convention on the Prohibition of Military or Any Other Hostile Use of Environmental Modification Techniques" - the ENMOD Convention. In addition to Australia, the following Member States are sponsors of the draft resolution: Algeria, Argentina, Bulgaria, Canada, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia,

(Ms. Moules, Australia)

Egypt, Finland, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Japan, New Zealand, Norway, Pakistan, Poland, the Republic of Korea, Romania, the Russian Federation, Sweden, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America.

(Ms. Moules, Australia)

The Second Review Conference of the Parties to the ENMOD Convention was held in Geneva from 14 to 18 September 1992. The meeting successfully reviewed in detail the content of the Convention and conducted a comprehensive debate about its overall place in the field of disarmament and its capacity to be made relevant to contemporary circumstances. A series of engaging and interesting proposals were considered with a view to defining more clearly the scope of the Convention, improving its effectiveness, and enhancing its appeal to a wider number of countries.

The Review Conference produced an agreed Final Document, which reaffirms the strong common interest of States parties in preventing the use of environmental modification techniques for military or any other hostile purpose. In the Final Document, States parties reaffirm their strong support for the Convention, their continued dedication to its principles and objectives, and their commitment to implement its provisions effectively.

The Final Document contains - and this is important - an agreed understanding on the prohibition of the use of herbicides as a method of warfare. This is a major issue for several countries, and covers an important dimension of the norms which will be established under the chemical weapons Convention. Had the Review Conference failed to deal adequately with this issue, significant problems could have been created in other contexts.

The Final Document also reaffirms the undertaking of all States parties to consult one another and to cooperate in solving any problems that may arise in relation to the objectives of, or in the application of the provisions of, the Convention. In this context we note that a number of States parties are

(Ms. Moules, Australia)

considering requesting the convening of a consultative committee of experts, as provided for under article V of the Convention. Australia will, of course, participate actively in such a meeting.

States parties to the ENMOD Convention are in agreement that achieving the widest possible adherence to the Convention is an important and worthy goal. Hence, in the Final Declaration the Review Conference calls upon all signatory States to ratify the Convention without delay, and upon those States which have not signed the Convention to accede to it as soon as possible. The Conference also calls upon all successor States, as appropriate, to confirm their membership or to take necessary actions to become parties to the Convention, and upon all other newly independent States to accede to the Convention.

Convinced that universal adherence to the ENMOD Convention would be a significant contribution to international confidence and to the strengthening of trust among nations, we sincerely hope that the next Review Conference will see a substantially expanded membership.

In essence, the draft resolution we are now introducing reflects the consensus views of States parties to the ENMOD Convention, as contained in the Final Document of the Second Review Conference. It is our hope that the draft resolution will be adopted by the Committee by consensus.

The CHAIRMAN: I call on the representative of Mongolia to introduce draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.16.

Mr. MUNKH-ORGIL (Mongolia): On behalf of its sponsors, I have the honour to introduce today the draft resolution entitled "Disarmament Week",

(Mr. Munkh-Orgil, Mongolia)

contained in document A/C.1/47/L.16. The draft resolution is sponsored by the delegations of Afghanistan, Belarus, Canada, China, Costa Rica, the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Indonesia, Japan, Kazakhstan, Kyrgyzstan, Malaysia, the Federated States of Micronesia, Mongolia, Myanmar, Nepal, New Zealand, Pakistan, the Philippines, Samoa, Singapore, Tajikistan, Thailand, Turkmenistan, Ukraine and Viet Nam.

Observed annually since 1978, Disarmament Week has contributed substantially to an increase in general public awareness of and support for the disarmament process and the role of the United Nations in this field. The Secretary-General's report, contained in document A/47/321, and the statements by the President of the General Assembly, the Secretary-General and the Chairman of this Committee at the recent special meeting of the First Committee held in observance of Disarmament Week, have proved once again that the international community continues to rely on Disarmament Week as an appropriate occasion for further promotion of national and international activities designed to educate and inform the public at large, in a balanced manner, concerning the major disarmament issues and developments.

The text of the draft resolution before us reproduces with some slight changes the text of General Assembly resolution 44/119 G, which was adopted without a vote.

In the preamble to draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.16 the General Assembly would note the recent momentous developments in the world, welcome the important disarmament achievements of late, note the increasing role and prestige of the United Nations, emphasize anew the need for and the importance of world public support of disarmament efforts, recall the decisions

(Mr. Munkh-Orgil, Mongolia)

concerning Disarmament Week taken by the General Assembly at its first, second and third special sessions devoted to disarmament, and recognize the significance of the annual observance of Disarmament Week.

In the operative part of the draft resolution the General Assembly would take note with appreciation of the Secretary-General's report (A/47/321); commend all States and organizations for their support and participation in Disarmament Week; invite States that so desired to take into account the model programme for Disarmament Week, while carrying out appropriate measures; invite Governments and international and national non-governmental organizations to continue to take part in Disarmament Week; and to inform the Secretary-General of the activities undertaken; invite the Secretary-General to continue to use the United Nations information organs to promote better understanding among the world public of disarmament problems and the objectives of Disarmament Week; and decide, finally, to include in the provisional agenda of the fiftieth session of the General Assembly an item entitled "Disarmament Week".

In conclusion, I wish to express the hope of the sponsors that draft resolution A/C.I/47/L.16 will be adopted by the First Committee without a vote.

Mr. AROSEMENA ARIAS (Panama) (interpretation from Spanish): First, through you, Sir, I should like to convey to Mr. Elaraby, our Chairman and the representative of Egypt, our sincere condolences following the recent earthquake which struck his country. It is my Government's wish that Egypt may recover very soon from this tragedy.

For Panama, nuclear arms, as weapons of mass destruction, are a distinct

(Mr. Arosemena Arias, Panama)

danger to mankind and therefore to civilization, until general and complete nuclear disarmament is achieved. Within this context, there can be no justification for the use of such weapons, even as a measure of self-defence, still less, in our view, can we justify the use or threat of the use of such weapons in order to achieve political objectives. Therefore, Panama, as a party to the Treaty of Tlatelolco, supports any United Nations action which would prohibit nuclear weapons in the Western hemisphere and proposes the extension of such measures to the rest of the world.

We would like to say that we support the views of the Government of Venezuela so eloquently expressed by its representative a short while ago.

As to chemical weapons and toxic waste, my country reaffirms its position, expressed in document A/47/362, that:

> "... Panama has no institutions, facilities, equipment, matériel, laboratories or depots for the production or storage of chemical weapons or of injurious or deadly substances, munitions or devices which employ toxic agents ...". (A/47/362, p. 4)

Similarly, there are no deposits or accumulations of this kind of toxic waste.

Accordingly, Panama supports the efforts aimed at achieving a multilateral convention that would completely and effectively prohibit the development, production, stockpiling and use of chemical weapons, and that would emphasize particularly their destruction.

Similarly, the prevailing climate of political détente in international relations resulting from the end of the cold war makes very remote the possibility of a conflict which would involve the use of what has been

(Mr. Arosemena Arias, Panama)

described as "the poor man's atomic bomb", that is to say bacteriological weapons. Therefore, my country welcomes the efforts under way to control and eliminate this instrument of warfare.

(Mr. Arosemena Arias, Panama)

Much has been achieved, globally, with regard to the control and limitation of armaments. Undoubtedly, this has been one of the most encouraging results of the end of the cold war. Nevertheless, even more can be achieved in this respect and in the building of confidence between States if we bring about regional disarmament.

With the fall of the Berlin Wall and the elimination of communism in Eastern Europe, the danger of a world conflict has been reduced almost to zero. In fighting at this level it is obvious that Panama offers no threat to anyone. In my country we have to eliminate our army, inter alia by constitutional means, through a referendum to be held on 15 November next.

Nevertheless, Panama is more worried about regional conflicts that may affect it, since some countries in the area continue to have disproportionately large armed forces, to judge by their legitimate self-defence needs, both internal and external. Consequently, we are striving for regional disarmament and we appeal to the international community to attach importance to this subject, because, as we see it, this is the other aspect of the new world order.

As the President of my country, Mr. Guillermo Endara Galimany, said, at the forty-seventh session of the General Assembly, on 29 September 1992:

> "In the area of regional disarmament, Panama, under the Treaty of Tlatelolco and recent proposed amendments to it, and as a signatory to the Ayacucho Declaration, has made a commitment to cooperate in efforts in this direction, as well as in efforts to ban nuclear weapons and eliminate conventional arms in Latin America. Taking into account the concepts of peace and stability, our country has truly and effectively abolished the army and is in the process of introducing constitutional

(Mr. Arosemena Arias, Panama)

reforms that will make it impossible to re-establish any kind of military organization in Panama. If the Panamanian people supports this plan in the referendum next November, we will be - together with Costa Rica - two American countries whose constitution and laws ban the existence of an army. In this way we will have eliminated the possibility of re-establishing military regimes, of sorry memory, that did such harm throughout the history of Panama." (A/47/PV.16, p. 4)

Panama has suffered at first hand from the dangers of having an army. Our unfortunate experience of 21 years of military government has convinced us that we must eliminate all military forces and shift the economic resources intended for their maintenance to other items that will make it possible to solve problems relating to health, housing and education and to tackle the classic problems of underdevelopment, such as poverty, hunger and illiteracy.

At the forty-seventh session our Head of State made the following statement to the General Assembly:

"Both domestically and internationally, we are in favour of diverting resources that have hitherto been assigned to miliary activities towards efforts to promote the economic and social development of the people and the protection of the environment. If the great and powerful of this world have come to understand the necessity of reducing military spending, then there is even more reason for the smaller countries to understand that our wars must be wars against poverty and illiteracy. (ibid.)

(Mr. Arosemena Arias, Panama)

Attacking the problems of under-development, which have been mentioned, and at the same time preserving the constitutional arrangements for maintaining democracy, as Panama is doing right now, all this is in accordance with the redefinition of the concept of security which has emerged following the end of the cold war. This redefinition, which embraces aspects of economic and social progress, should be the common objective of the Latin American and third world countries.

Thus, we express our belief that what is known as the "peace dividend" - which we have been so anxious to bring to the attention of the major Powers - should be extended not only to the budgets of regional Powers but also to all countries. To fail to do this would be hypocrisy on a world scale. It is clear that for our peoples the reduction of military expenditures on the national or regional level is as important as doing so at the world level, if not more so.

If Panama is in the process of eliminating its army, it is in our interest for other countries in the region to do the same. If it has been possible to establish nuclear-weapon-free zones, the same could be done with regard to conventional weapons at the regional level. Efforts to bring about effective preventive diplomacy which would make it possible to solve international conflicts through dialogue, negotiation and understanding should be encouraged, with a view to abolishing once and for all the use of force in international relations. Hence any initiative relating to conventional disarmament will receive our firm support.

As a signatory of the Treaty of Tlatelolco, Panama supports the United Nations in its efforts to bring about regional disarmament.

(Mr. Arosemena Arias, Panama)

We welcome the Secretary-General's efforts to keep alive the subject of improving multilateral efforts for peace, I should like to conclude my statement by endorsing the words used in his thoughtful contribution to the new international order in his report on the work of the Organization:

"Just as today no two conflicts are the same, so the design of cooperation and the division of labour in the service of peace, stability and renewal after conflict must be approached with flexibility and creativity adapted to each particular situation. In this regard, regional arrangements and agencies have new contributions to make. (A/47/1, para. 113)

The CHAIRMAN: I shall convey to Mr. Elaraby the kind words of condolence which the representative of Panama expressed with regard to the tragic earthquake in Egypt. I call on the Secretary of the Committee.

Mr. KHERADI (Secretary of the Committee): I would like to inform the Committee that the following countries have joined in sponsoring the following draft resolutions:

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.8: Costa Rica, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Japan;

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.9: Malaysia;

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.17: Colombia;

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.18: Costa Rica;

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.20: Norway, Greece, India; and

Draft resolution A/C.1/47/L.42: Japan.

The meeting rose at 11.15 a.m.